

The Christian News-Letter

No. 214

Edited by
J. H. OLDHAM

August 9th, 1944

DEAR MEMBER,

Thousands of town-dwellers are now giving part or all of their holidays to helping farmers to bring in the harvest. Many of them will, therefore, hear for themselves the question which is uppermost in the minds of countrymen: "What will happen to agriculture after this war? Will it be the same as last time—national concern, lavish promises while our products were urgently needed—indifference, neglect and possibly ruin once the crisis has faded from memory?"

THE WAR-TIME ACHIEVEMENTS OF AGRICULTURE

There cannot be many people in this country who do not know that but for the tremendous quantities of food produced on our own soil we might have come very near to starvation during this war. The measure of the achievement is staggering. We now grow on a rough estimate between 70 and 75 per cent of our total requirements in food.¹ This large increase of food had to be won from the soil in the teeth of the over-riding claims of the fighting forces on man power. We entered this war with 2,000,000 fewer acres of arable land than we had in 1914, some of it in poorer condition. Whereas between 1921 and 1924 we had 816,000 persons engaged in agriculture, by 1938 there had been a drop of 25 per cent to 607,000. This comparatively small body of skilled workers have borne the main burden of the day, working prodigious hours, and by their skill and knowledge ensuring that the best possible use was made of a huge army of trained landgirls and of what might have been a mob, but has in effect been an organized force of part-timers. Behind these lies the contribution of those who designed and made farm machinery of all types (there has been a fourfold increase in agricultural machinery during the war), of the scientists who perfected new types of seed, discovered the potentialities of varieties of soils and improved the use of fertilisers, and of the County War Agricultural Committees, who by monetary assistance, wise planning, and insistence on standards have done much to raise the level of farming practice.

THE DECLINE OF AGRICULTURE BETWEEN THE WARS

If then there has been the possibility of such vast achievement on the land during the war, are the stories of a "decline in agriculture" to be taken at their face value?

First we must say that in some respects there was progress in the period between the wars. A certain number of farmers, faced with ruin if they continued on old lines, struck out on new ones. They were helped in this by the development of agricultural education and

¹ In terms of weight, not of nutritional value.

Distributed in the U.S.A. by

by the work of research institutes. Although the acreage under cultivation and the number of men employed declined, the output per man and per cultivated acre showed some increase. Whatever we may think about subsidies, we did see in the inter-war period a significant break with the cast-iron tradition that only what pays in hard cash should survive.

These gains, however, were slight compared with the loss. For one farmer who with knowledge, hard work and sufficient capital to be able to afford a few unsuccessful experiments and to buy machinery, there were dozens, some of them equally hardworking and knowledgeable, who when war, or rather the fear of war, came, were only just managing to hold out against ruin. The better his crop the smaller, on the whole, was the farmer's return on his labour. He was at the mercy, not of winds and weather, but of the equally uncontrollable and more maleficent powers of changing markets and prices. There were many essentials which he could not afford. Hedging, drainage, repairs, renewals—however essential—had to be put off; the plough was taken less over the land. Farsighted planning, the foundation of good farming, dependent on reasonable prospects of a fair return, had to give place to a hand-to-mouth attempt to head off disaster. The land itself was a chief sufferer. Much became derelict, sinking back to rough grass, much was being exhausted by having less put into it than was being taken out.

At the same time agriculture was losing annually a great toll of skilled workers, particularly younger men, to the towns.¹ Most of them went for higher wages. Agricultural wages have lagged far behind industrial wages, although every farm worker is in some sense a skilled man.² But perhaps nearly as many went to get a house, for better education, more chances of promotion, and out of a paralysing fear that agriculture was done for.

HOPES OF RECOVERY

What do those who work on the land want after the war? Do they want large subsidies and complete independence? There is a general dislike of subsidies as humiliating, and since the war a realization that agriculture cannot tolerate the inefficient farmer. There is no one voice on all points, but there are certain clear requirements, of which the chief is the stabilization of prices within such limits as will provide reasonable security for farmers and a good steady wage for agricultural workers, without creating scarcity or high prices for the population at large. Conflict rages round the question of nationalization of the land, or control of its uses. The Scott, Uthwatt and Barlow reports all discuss matters which affect agriculture, and all await Government decision. We can scarcely decide who or what should own agricultural land until we know what is to be agricultural land, where the spread of towns is to stop and on what terms, and where industry is to be placed. From the agriculturalist's point of view, back

¹ Between 1924 and 1939 there was a fall of 44 per cent in the number of agricultural workers under the age of twenty-one.

² Average agricultural wages were: 1914, 18/- per week; 1918, 30/-; 1921, 44/5; 1924 (Repeal of Corn Production Act), 28/-; Agricultural Wages Act 1924 followed by a slow rise to 30/7 in 1934 (a lower *real* wage than 1914); 1944, £3 5s. a week and overtime.

of the land question lies the issue "How can a flow of capital to the land be achieved adequate to ensure sufficient improvements and developments and proper maintenance of the soil?"

Much depends on Government action, but by no means all. No subsidies and regulations can achieve recovery if in people's minds is rooted the conviction that British agriculture is due for extinction. Signs of recovery of faith in the future and of renewed desire for work on the land are small, but significant. Young farmers' clubs have had a remarkable growth,¹ not only in those clubs which consist of those who are already farmers. Many operate in senior schools in the country and even in some towns. Of the children who have been evacuated to the country a surprising number want to work on the land. During the war years—and beginning before the war—a number of agricultural communities were growing up, men and women with little or no experience in farming turning to life on the land. Some have a religious basis, some are pacifists; some will survive, many no doubt will not make the running. Among prisoners of war the demand for agricultural books for study is very high.

British agriculture and its problems have been set in a wider context by the decisions of the Hot Springs Conference. The simple truth that food is for eating and that very few people in the world have enough of it comes like a breath of fresh air to our deliberations. The forty-four allied nations recommended that each country should, with a view to getting more food for everybody and raising the standard of life of the primary producer everywhere, base its agricultural policy on three principles: (1) To maintain the fertility of the soil; (2) To protect crops and livestock from disease; (3) To promote steady employment through the year by balanced rotational farming. The relief of starvation in Europe provides an immediate objective; in our own country if every child and mother were to get the milk and vegetables they need rather than afford, a thriving agriculture would be needed to supply them.

THE RECOVERY OF AGRICULTURE AND THE FUTURE OF THE COUNTRYSIDE

Two questions of great importance are interdependent. One is what is to be the fate of agriculture after the war. More people are likely to show a livelier interest in the preservation of the countryside than in the future of agriculture. The public conscience is still only half awake to the ravages of builders, to the sprawl of the towns along the high roads, the rash of hideous buildings, shacks, factories, garages which disfigure so much that could be lovely. But the never-ending stream of books of every kind about the countryside indicates not only a natural nostalgic longing for peace in the midst of war, but a returning eagerness to know the countryside. Among the younger generation there is a greater love of the *look* of the country than there was, and more chance by hiking and camping of seeing it than town-dwellers had a generation ago. Their concern with it is as the townsman's pleasure ground. What is far from being realized is that the country-

¹ See Professor Ashby's interesting pamphlet on the future of Young Farmers' Clubs. Selwyn House, Endsleigh Street, W.C. 1. Price 1s.

side gives the satisfaction that it does precisely because it is not a pleasure ground, but a workshop.

The English countryside as we know it—with its little fields, tall hedges, open downland, small villages, scattered homesteads, winding lanes—is the pattern left upon the land by the practice of a certain kind of agriculture. If we omit open moorland and mountain, nearly all the sights we admire in the country—fields, woods, orchards, cottages, or what you will—were made for use. Without the practice of agriculture the English countryside would be a jungle of brambles, bracken and thistles. To love the face of England and be indifferent to the future of British agriculture is a contradiction in terms.

But British agriculture has done more than produce a landscape which, because it is functioning aright, looks lovely. It has helped to produce the distinctive life and culture of the English countryside. Its co-partner in producing this culture has been the Christian religion.

Many have analysed and captured the particular quality in English country life which, in spite of hardships, holds men and women to itself and attracts others to share its joys. These joys, infinite in number, fall into two categories—nearness to nature and community with one's fellow men. Nearness to nature means not proximity, but dependence upon it; so that the pattern of everyday living is set by the swing of the seasons, by rain and sun, by the soil. There is in British farming a long tradition of "husbandry," of doing one's duty by the soil and keeping it in good heart. Fundamentally this is a religious tradition, an attitude which regards the soil as a part of God's creation, fulfilling God's purposes, with a claim upon man that it should be rightly used and its richness increased by good farming.

The life in community which is still to be found in village England is also the product of the practice of agriculture and the influence of Christianity. The parish church dominating the village street, still its crowning glory, reflects the past age in which the church was in all other senses the centre of the community's life and when the teaching of the Gospel underlay the relationships of men with their neighbours. Nothing has taken its place: we have cherished its buildings more than its life; the old, sick, or unsuccessful parson has been "good enough" for the country parish, just as the uncertificated teacher has been "good enough" for the country school.

If the countryside is to be preserved for future generations not only as a spectacle, but as providing a satisfying way of life, then the next few years in Government planning, popular interest and most of all, in the type of men and women who go to live and work in it, are critical indeed.

Major R. A. C. Radcliffe is Deputy Assistant Director of Army Welfare Services. He left the regular army in 1932 to take up social work, returning to the army at the outbreak of war.

Yours sincerely,

Kathleen Bliss

BACK FROM THE SERVICES

By MAJOR R. A. C. RADCLIFFE

A young officer recently wrote to me from Italy on the subject of his return to civil life after the war. He said, "I've been weighing up the pros and cons, and I think it will be every bit as difficult as taking my men into action for the first time, and I am worrying about it a lot."

It is the purpose of this Supplement to try to help those who have not been in close touch with the Services during the war to understand the difficulties and points of view of the returning servicemen. I write as a soldier who, though in uniform, has seen no active service during this war, and although my personal experience is principally of soldiers, I have little doubt that my remarks apply almost equally to sailors and airmen.

When a man joins the Services, he leaves his job, his home and his community, and for the duration of the war he does a different job, or many different jobs, and becomes a member of a new community, which in certain respects takes the place of his home.

On his discharge, the ex-serviceman will, therefore, have to re-adjust himself to these three things—job, home and community—and although the three affect each other in many ways, it will be simpler to consider them separately. Before doing so, however, it is important to appreciate that the task of re-adjustment will often be almost as difficult for the older men as for the younger ones who have had no adult experience of civil life. This is because the older that one gets, the more difficult it is to re-adjust oneself, and also because these older men have already gone through the psychological strain of one tremendous re-adjustment in their lives when they turned from civilians to soldiers, and to make a second one, even when it is a return to something familiar, will be far from easy.

ADJUSTMENT TO CIVIL EMPLOYMENT

The problem of the soldier's re-adjustment to his civil job is a very complex one, which cannot possibly be dealt with fully here.

There are first the practical problems of rehabilitation, retraining, reinstatement, etc., which are, it seems, being tackled by both Government Ministries and Industry with a great deal more imagination and foresight than ever before, and with a wise understanding of the human aspects involved; then there are such problems as the effects on men's health of the change over from the outdoor active life of the Services to the indoor, sedentary or static life of office and factory, and their reactions to the casual and often crude methods of factory discipline after the stricter but far more

skilful Service discipline ; and, finally, there are the spiritual satisfactions—if one may call them that—which men have discovered in their Service jobs, and about which I wish to write here.

Sense of Purpose in Work—Partnership and Loyalty

Probably the most important of these satisfactions has been the sense of purpose and worth in their work. It is an experience that many outside the Services have shared, and will equally wish to continue. In its wider aspect, the question of how to continue that sense of purpose and worth in daily work is obviously beyond the scope of this Supplement ; but it is too often forgotten that men may be doing a most worthwhile job and yet, through bad handling, be quite unmindful of its importance.

The Services, deprived of the ordinary industrial incentives to good work, have always given special study to the ways and means of bringing home to men's minds the importance of their work and the value of each man's individual contribution, and in this war—in which psychology has been so potent a weapon—the subject has received the closest attention.

The result of this study is, I think, exemplified—so far as the army is concerned—in General Montgomery's brilliant leadership of the famous Eighth Army. To the old and well-established incentives of *esprit de corps* and personal loyalty to a leader, has been added the more modern one of a sense of partnership. By this appreciation of the very natural desire of men in an educated democracy like ours to be treated as intelligent partners rather than as brainless cogs, the army has done much to break down that conception of a world of warring "we's" and "they's" which is such a dangerous and hampering element in the thinking of so many of the people in this country to-day. Officers are instructed to give their men reasons for orders, regulations, restrictions, etc., whenever it is possible, and to encourage them to bring forward suggestions and ideas. This treatment secures the men's willing and intelligent co-operation in whatever has to be done.

Factories and mines have, of course, been working along similar lines with their Works Councils and Pit Production Committees. It is to be hoped that they have learnt, as the army has learnt, the great value of these methods of consultation in inculcating a real sense of partnership, and that they will develop them after the war, so that the returning soldier may not only feel at home in this atmosphere, but be able to contribute helpful ideas from his experiences in wider and different fields of action. In this connection the many hundreds of thousands whose work is neither in factory nor pit, but who will want to take a larger share in the management of the concern which employs them, must be remembered and provided for.

But men still want their loyalties, and feel starved and lost without them. First the loyalty to a cause, and then to their unit, and thirdly the loyalty to their leader.

The "Current Affairs" discussions in the army have done a great deal to help soldiers to understand and value the cause for which they are fighting, and at the same time these discussions have stimulated their minds and made them more intelligent and, therefore, better soldiers. It will be sad indeed, both for Industry and the country as a whole, if this great job of adult education is allowed to lapse after the war, and cinemas and dog-tracks are enabled to regain their mastery over the awakened minds of these men. There is much that Industry could do in this matter, and will surely do if it honestly wants the co-operation of thinking men, not robots, in the tasks ahead.

The other army loyalties too must be continued. Most firms try, with very varying success, to secure the loyalty of their employees; but far fewer, particularly in the larger concerns, try to get a personal relationship between those who direct policy and give orders and those who carry out that policy and those orders. Ordinary men—and this particularly applies to the soldier who has enjoyed personal leadership—refuse to feel loyalty to vague, shadowy figures who sit in large offices and never enter their lives in any personal way. This job cannot be left to personnel and welfare officers, however good. Somehow or other directors and managers must all find means of getting to know the people who work for them, and of showing them clearly that they take a personal interest in them and their welfare, and can talk with them like ordinary human beings.

The most elaborate welfare schemes will often cause as much discontent as satisfaction unless the people who sponsor them understand, and have the confidence and trust of, the people for whom they plan—and personal contacts are an absolutely essential pre-condition of mutual understanding and trust.

The Nature of the Job—Pride in Work, Initiative, Sense of Responsibility and Adventure

The second spiritual experience has come to many men from the nature of the job that they have had to do in the army. The vast majority of soldiers are highly skilled men—the infantry men no less so than the men of the technical corps—and, in becoming skilled men, they have learnt to feel a pride in the doing of their jobs which they were never able to experience in civil life.

The late John Hilton, who knew the working man of this country better than anyone, commented on this pride of skill—"style" he termed it—in one of his last broadcasts on his return from a visit to the Forces in North Africa after the capture of Tunis. He said that it was the thing which had struck him most forcibly

about the men to whom he spoke. The engineer was proud of the bridges he had helped to build, the signaller of the line he had laid, the baker of the loaves he had baked, and so on.

In their army jobs, men have also learnt for the first time to use their initiative, to take and feel responsibility and to lead others. Modern warfare with its small mobile teams, so different from the static warfare of 1914-18, is a great developer of individual initiative, and a very high proportion of men have to take responsibility and act as leaders.

Finally, their jobs have given them adventure and excitement. It is difficult to see how most men will be able to find these satisfactions in their civil jobs. Perhaps the best that we can hope for is that the employers to whom they return will do their utmost to make full use of the new skills and powers that these men have acquired. That, at least, will be a great improvement on what happened last time, though, the nature of modern Industry being what it is, many will be left unsatisfied and compelled to seek compensating satisfaction in their leisure tasks—at the best a substitute for the real thing, however much modern civilization may try to disguise the fact from itself.

Security of Employment

The third of these spiritual experiences results from the security of employment which men have in the Services. On the negative side, this relieves them from that haunting fear of insecurity in civil life, the reality of which was so dramatically illustrated by the question put to Mr. Bevin by soldiers embarking for the invasion: "When we have done this job for you, Ernie, are we coming back to the dole queue?" But spiritually, the positive side has far greater significance in three ways. First, men feel that society has a real need for their services and are quite clear about the nature of that need; second, men are encouraged to co-operate with and help one another instead of competing against each other in the devil-take-the-hindmost scramble of civilian life; and third, men are enabled to give of their best to their jobs without any hampering thoughts about profit and wages.

The Spirit of Good Comradeship

The good comradeship of war is the last, and probably the most obvious, of these spiritual experiences. At its best and highest it is a classless comradeship without distinction of rank and position, where in a unit of many different ranks each is for all and all for each; in its more ordinary form, it is the devoted friendship of one man for his mate, or the comradeship of a group of men together. In both cases, danger and hardship are enriching elements. But in civil life as we live it, there is practically no counterpart at all for this comradeship between men, despite the fact that it seems to

satisfy for many men one of their greatest spiritual needs. Miners and seamen get nearest to it by the nature of their tasks.

For most men, fortunately, the family life to which they return will be a more than adequate compensation for this loss of male comradeship, and as it is probably impossible for anyone to combine the two successfully in this world, there is nothing to grieve about on that score. But it will be a very real loss to the country as well as to those concerned if the comradeship and understanding that has developed between officers and men perishes after the war through a lack of opportunities to make contacts. That it will not perish through a lack of desire to keep it alive I am sure, but the difficulties are very great, and certainly cannot be solved by such well-meant superficialities as annual re-union dinners, which were too often a hollow mockery of all the fine comradeship of the last war.

The greatest impediment is, probably, the way in which we are housed in our towns, class by class, according to our incomes; so that we never get a chance to mix naturally with those of different living standards from our own. This mutual understanding between classes is, I believe, so important for the future of this country, and so impossible under present living conditions, that all who can should try to influence those concerned with the rebuilding of Britain, and persuade them to plan their new housing estates on quite different principles.

The Dudley Committee report¹ just published takes this view and pleads strongly for the building of "neighbourhood units," as it calls them, in our towns, instead of the development of purely residential settlements for a single social class. These "neighbourhood units" would have many different types of houses, so that there could be, as in the villages, a proper balance of people of different classes, who could share some portion of their life together—the shops, the pub, the Church, the sports ground, etc.—and so form a real community.

If this were done, our civilization might retain and develop the most important aspect of war comradeship, always provided, of course, everyone was properly housed.

RE-ADJUSTMENT TO HOME LIFE

It is highly doubtful if many men realize just what it is that the army is doing to their future relationship with their wives and children when it separates them so cruelly for a number of years. To the onlooker it is, of course, obvious that they will be very different people when they at last return to one another, but to the average soldier this inescapable fact of change is, I think, far less apparent. Not only is he often unaware how much his own war experiences have altered him—my late batman assured me in a

¹ "Design of Dwellings." H.M. Stationery Office. 1s.

recent letter that four years of soldiering had not altered him in any way!—but he is also inclined to make no allowance for his wife's experiences and to expect that she will be just the same in every respect as when he left her. "I left behind a pretty young wife, and have returned to find 'an old soldier,' hardened by four years' factory work," one man complained bitterly to me the other day. The growing up of the children beyond their father's control is also a likely cause of friction.

In his passionate longing for his home, the soldier wants in fact to return to things as they were, and is also prone to idealize the past, and to build up a picture in his mind of a "dream home" which never really existed. The main ingredients of this "dream home" are usually physical love, affection and understanding, privacy, home comforts, children to play with, and the important and satisfying rôle of paterfamilias—all the very things of which army life deprives him.

The problem of helping the soldier to re-adjust himself to his home is, therefore, doubly complicated. There are, first, the inevitable changes which have taken place in each person due to factors outside the cognisance of the other—the greatest significance of those changes lies in the fact that they have been caused by experiences which have not only not been shared, but which to a large extent are beyond the imagination of the other. It must be remembered that many soldiers have been out of the country almost since the start of the war, and have seen little at first hand of the tremendous things that women have done, and suffered. And secondly, the instinctive resistance of the soldier to any change at all.

Now, while the war is still on, something can be done, and is being done through "Current Affairs" discussions, to help the soldier overseas to realize the great part being played by women in this war; and by inference to appreciate that women who have left their homes to work in factories, be bus conductresses, air-raid wardens and so on, and have had full responsibility for running their homes, are unlikely to be quite the same people after those experiences as they were before them.

Many padres and regimental officers also, when dealing with their men's home problems, help their men with wise advice to a better understanding.

But however much is done in the way of education along these lines, the time when the soldier will be in need of the greatest help will be when he actually gets home, and discovers for himself the truth of what others have tried to tell him—that things are not as they were and can never be just the same again, however much he may want it otherwise. At the very moment when he expects to be able to relax amongst those who know and love him, he will often find himself in a strange and unfamiliar atmosphere.

His officer, his padre, his own army pals—those people who have shared the ups and downs of life with him for such a large slice of his life, and understand him—will be no longer with him, and he will feel in sore need of a wise counsellor.

It is to be hoped that his own friends, the Church, the social welfare organizations—which have done so much for the soldier and his family during the war—and personnel officers in industry will between them be able to meet his need. By so doing they will be making a very important contribution to the happy resettlement of the soldier. It will be tragedy indeed if the men and women who, in their different rôles, have endured so much for the sake of the home fail through lack of mutual understanding to live happily together in it when they at last get the opportunity so long waited for.

There will, of course, be a certain number of men—far fewer than many fear—who will return to homes which have, in their absence, been broken beyond any repair. They will also need much sympathy and help, but their re-adjustments will be of a different and more obvious nature, and need no description here.

RE-ADJUSTMENT TO THE COMMUNITY

There remains the soldier's re-adjustment to the community.

It is essential for the health of the community that the returning soldiers should be absorbed happily into it, and not left out in the cold—bitter, disillusioned and with an unwanted feeling. Only thus can we benefit fully from the revitalizing experiences that they have undergone, and also repay our debts of honour to them.

But the reabsorption will not happen as the result of wishful thinking; we shall have to appreciate the soldier's point of view about us, and be ready to re-adjust ourselves to meet him, instead of, as after the last war, expecting him to do all the re-adjustment while we sit back, and treat him as a rather strange and fearful animal who must be gradually tamed into our nice conventional ways of thought and conduct again.

It will, perhaps, help if we understand clearly how many soldiers do think about many of us men who have not been far from our homes this war. If one of them would speak bluntly, he might say:—

"You have lived at home while we have been far away; you have lived with your wives and children or been near your families, while we have become almost strangers to ours; you have slept in comfortable beds, while we have slept hard; you have kept fit and well, while our bodies are full of rheumatism and the fevers of the East; you have gone on doing your job, and getting advancement in it, while we have lost our skill, are out of touch with our employers, and have had to start again from the beginning; you are used to the routine of civil life; we find everything difficult, and your conventions stupid, narrow and unintelligible; you have lived fairly

securely, while we have been facing danger and death for you ; you have had good money all the time, and lived well and without many worries ; we have had little money, and our wives have grown old with the worries and strain of their efforts to keep things going in our absence. Finally, you have been able to save and keep your homes going, while we have to spend all our savings and war bonus and more in starting a home again, when we can find one."

Of course his picture is a bit distorted, and we could tell him a lot of things about our heroism and suffering here that he has not realized apparently ; but we are the debtors—there can be no honest doubt about that—and our proper rôle, therefore, is to hold our tongues about ourselves, and understand how these men feel, and, if allowances have to be made, to make them fully and gladly.

But we must not rest content with understanding him, we must also do practical things to make sure that we get the full value of his contribution. In Industry, in Parliament, in Local Government, in the Civil Service, in the Church, in the professions and in social service, these people from another world must be given places fitting to their experience and their age ; at all costs we must avoid making the mistakes of the last war, when those who had served were too often given the bottom places everywhere and driven into bitterness and disillusion—the harvest of which we are still reaping.

The other day a man told me just how he felt when on his return to his firm after the last war, in which he had rendered good service, the manager told him that he would have to start at the bottom and work hard to make up "for the four years that he had wasted."

It is a choice between fusion and confusion. The right choice will mean much sacrifice and unselfishness on the part of many of those who have stayed at home, and who will very probably feel when the war ends that they have already done their full share of giving up. Whether it is made or not will therefore depend a great deal on whether the absolute necessity for it is clearly realized, and on whether we have leaders with the courage to continue to demand sacrifices from us for the common good when the war is over. It will be, perhaps, the greatest and most critical test of democratic leadership that this country has ever faced. Let us hope and pray that we pass the test successfully.

Subscriptions—12s. 6d. (\$3.00 in U.S.A. and Canada) for one year. 6s. 6d. for six months (Great Britain and Ireland only). Single copies 6d. ; reduction for quantities.

All communications and subscriptions should be sent to—
THE CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER, 19 DEAN'S YARD, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W. 1.

Published by Dr. J. H. Oldham for the Christian Frontier Council, and printed in Great Britain by the Church Army Press, Cowley, Oxford